



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE AUG 03 1984

RECEIVED

GROUP 2

In re Patent Application for: INVERTER CIRCUITS

Applicant: Ole K. Nilssen

Serial No: 06/555,426

Filed: NOVEMBER 23, 1983

Group Art Unit: 212

Examiner: BEHA, WILLIAM H., JR.

AMENDMENT B

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Commissioner:

In response to Office Action dated 07/19/84 (Paper No. 29), Applicant herewith provides the following arguments, amendments, and comments.

ARGUMENTS IN RE CLAIM REJECTIONS

In re claims 118 and 122

Examiner rejects Claims 118 and 122 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rhoads, referring to supporting rationale provided in previous Office action (Paper No. 27, page 3, first three full paragraphs).

In support of his rejection, Examiner further states that "claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution before the Office". Applicant is completely in agreement with the intent behind that statement. An important question, however, relates to the part: "broadest reasonable interpretation" -- the question being: what constitutes "reasonable"?

In respect to this question of "reasonable interpretation", Applicant contends that some of Examiner's arguments, specifically those represented by the second full paragraph on page 3 of the latest Office action (Paper No. 29), do not represent "reasonable interpretation".